



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/989,543 | 11/21/2001 | Toshiharu Katada | 111163 | 1690 |
| 25944 | 7590 | 09/20/2005 | EXAMINER | |
| OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320 | | | REID, CHERYL M | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2142 | |
| DATE MAILED: 09/20/2005 | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/989,543

Applicant(s)

KATADA ET AL.

Examiner

Cheryl M. Reid

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-19 have been examined.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 5, 9, 10, 11, 15, 18-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. ***Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Tullis et al (US 5802314).***

4. In regards to claims 1, 5, Stewart teaches of an input element...a location information.....the second device access the.....(Col 2, lines 50-67, Col 3, lines 4-8); input element (access point)and location information element (access point) included....(Col 2, lines60-63); specific device is transmitted.....first (portable device) and the second device (service provider)....(Fig 1A, Col 5 lines 60-65, Col 6 lines 5-40). Stewart does not explicitly teach of a scanner function, printer function, or the specific

Art Unit: 2142

data includes image data. In an analogous art, Tullis teaches on these aspects (col 1, lines 60-67, col 2, lines 1-7, Fig 14b). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the arts at the time of invention to incorporate the above teachings because the inventions are analogous art. One of ordinary skill in the arts at the time of invention would have been motivated for the reasons discussed by Tullis (col 1, lines 49-60).

5. In regards to claims 9 and 10, Stewart teaches of Stewart teaches of transmitting of least one of a location.....(Col 2, lines 50-67, Col 3, lines 4-8; second device to access first device.....).....(Fig 1A, Col 5 lines 60-65, Col 6 lines 5-40). In regards to the remaining limitations, see the discussion of claim 1 and 5.

6. In regards to claims 2-3, 6-7, the rejections were set forth in a previous office action mailed 03/01/2005.

7. In regards to claims 4 and 8, the rejections were set forth in a previous office action mailed 03/01/2005.

8. ***Claims 11, 15, 18,19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts et al (US 6295551) in view of Duperrouzel et al (US 6832355).***

9. In regards to claims 11, 15, 18,19 Roberts teaches of a first device service unit that generates data in order to display a web page used for the first device, and which can exchange the specific data with the first device(fig 6, item 164); a second device service unit that generates data in order to display a web page used for the second

Art Unit: 2142

device, and which can exchange the specific data with the second device(fig 6, item 188); a first web server unit that sends the data generated by the first device service unit according to a request; a second web server unit that sends the data generated by the second device service unit according to a request; a first web browser unit that sends the request to the first server unit, receives the data sent by the first server unit, and which, based on the data, displays the web page used for the first device including data symbols for displaying the specific data on a screen (col 28, lines 30-65); a second web browser unit that sends the request to the second server unit, receives the data sent by the second server unit, and which, based on the data, displays the web page used for the second device on same the screen (col 11, lines 35-67), wherein, , the first web browser unit hands over at least one of a location information of the first device service unit and a location information of the specific data to the second web browser unit, the second web browser unit forwards the handed over location information to the second device service via the second web server unit, and the second device service unit accesses the first device service unit based on the forwarded location information, acquires from the first device service unit the specific data obtained from the first device, and sends the specific data over to the second device (col 15, lines 50-67, col 16, lines 25-65). Robersts does not explicitly teach of when the data symbols on the screen included in the web page used for the first device are drag-and-dropped in a predetermined area of the web page used for the second device. In an analogous art, Duperrouzel teaches on this aspect (col 11, lines 25-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the arts at the time of invention to incorporate the above

Art Unit: 2142

teachings because the inventions are analogous art (i.e. the facilitating of communication using the internet). One of ordinary skill in the arts at the time of invention would have been motivated for the reasons discussed by Dupperrouzel (col 1, lines 45-67).

10. Claims 13,14, 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts et al (US 6295551) in view of Dupperrouzel as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Yamaguchi et al (US 20030123079).

11. In regards to claims 13,14, 16-17, the rejections were set forth in a previous office action mailed 03/01/2005.

12. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts et al (US 6295551) in view of Dupperrouzel as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Stewart.

13. In regards to claim 12, the rejections were set forth in a previous office action mailed 03/01/2005.

Conclusion

14. This action is non-final.

Art Unit: 2142

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cheryl M. Reid whose telephone number is 571 272 3903. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Fri (7-3:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

cmr


BEATRIZ PRIETO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Application/Control Number: 09/989,543

Page 7

Art Unit: 2142